DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 327 645 CE 056 624

TITLE	Review of Evaluation Procedures Used in Project POWER.
INSTITUTION	Ohio State Univ., Columbus. Center on Education and Training for Employment.
SPONS AGENCY	Triton Coll., River Grove, Ill.
PUB DATE	Mar 90
NOTE	24p.; For a related document, see ED 324 458.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Adult Basic Education; *Adult Literacy; *English (Second Language); *Evaluation Methods; Literacy Education; *Outcomes of Education; Program Effectiveness; Program Evaluation; Program Implementation; Program Improvement
IDENTIFIERS	Literacy Audits; *Triton College IL; *Workplace Literacy

ABSTRACT

Project POWER is a workplace literacy program conducted by Triton College. The project offers courses in English as a Second Language (ESL) and Adult Basic Education (ABE) to employers who are willing to pay their employees for half their class time and for 15 percent of the instructional costs. By the end of January 1990, the project had conducted 53 courses for 11 employers, enrolling 465 employees. Recommended practices were followed in planning and conducting the courses, including conducting a literacy skill audit for each company and incorporating company-specific materials in instruction. Students completed evaluation questionnaires at the end of each course and most of their responses were positive. Pre- and post-testing were conducted for almost all courses. The average gain for ESL students was half a grade level. The ABE students improved an average two-thirds to 1.5 grade equivalent. These gains are consistent with the 48 hours of instruction provided. The evaluation showed that, overall, the project achieved its objectives. However, the "literacy skills profile" that was specified was not created, and it could not be determined whether the objective to increase performance to levels established in the profile was achieved. (ESL and literacy assessment summaries and evaluation forms are appended.) (KC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED327645

REVIEW OF EVALUATION PROCEDURES USED IN PROJECT POWER

Conducted for

Triton College

by

Center on Education and Training for Employment
The Ohio State University

March 1990

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

C Hansen

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

1900 Kenny Road
Columbus, Ohio 43210-1090

CE 056 624

Table of Contents

	Page
Executive Summary	iii
Introduction	1
Outcomes	2
Achievement of Objectives	7
Recommendations	10
References	11
Appendix	12
ESL Assessment Summary	13
Literacy Assessment Summary	15
Instruments Used in Evaluation	17

List of Tables

Table

1	Student Evaluations of ESL Courses, Project Staff and CETE Tallies	3
2	Student Evaluations of ABE Courses, Project Staff and CETE Tallies	4
3	Sample of Instructors' Ratings of Student Progress in ESL and ABE Courses	6

Executive Summary

Project POWER is a workplace literacy program conducted by Triton College. The project offers courses in English as a Second Language (ESL) and Adult Basic Education (ABE) to employers who are willing to pay their employees for half their class time and for 15 percent of the instructional costs. By the end of January 1990, the project had conducted 53 courses for 11 different employers. These courses enrolled 465 employees and 410 completed them. From the number attending ongoing and scheduled courses, it is projected that a total of 630 employees will complete courses conducted by the project.

Recommended practices were followed in planning and conducting the courses. These practices included conducting a literacy skill audit for each company and incorporating company specific materials in instruction.

Students completed evaluation questionnaires at the end of each course and most of their responses are in the two (out of five) most positive ratings. Instructors, ratings of student progress tend to be in the third and fourth (out of five) rating points, with very few in the lowest category. Attempts to obtain ratings from direct supervisors yielded few usable responses.

Pre and post-testing were conducted for almost all courses. The average gain for ESL students was half a level. The ABE students improved, on the average, two-thirds to one and one-half grade equivalent. These gains are consistent with the 48 hours of instruction that were provided.

It is concluded that overall the project achieved its objectives. The reference to a "literacy skill profile" in Objective III, however, was never specified in quantitative terms and consequently a conclusive judgement on its attainment is not possible.

Introduction

This is the report of a review of the procedures used by Triton College to evaluate the implementation and effectiveness of Project POWER, a workplace literacy program partially funded by the Office of Vocational and Adult Education, the U.S. Department of Education. The review was conducted for Triton College by the Center on Education and Training for Employment, (CETE) The Ohio State University. Drs. Valija Axelrod and Morgan Lewis of the Center staff participated in the review. Dr. Axelrod planned the activities to be conducted and initiated a search for related literature. Dr. Lewis reviewed the assembled literature, conducted the site visit to Triton, and prepared this report.

The report briefly describes the operation and outcomes of Project POWER as reflected in summaries prepared by the project staff. It then presents the three main objectives of the project and the evidence relevant to their accomplishment. On the basis of this evidence, recommendations for improvement in evaluation procedures are offered.

Project POWER Overview

Project POWER was developed by Triton College to respond to the large number of requests it was receiving from employers for programs to improve the basic communications and computational skills of their workers. Triton did not have the capacity within its Employee Development Institute to provide the amount of instruction being requested. In cooperation with the Labor-Management Center of the Mid-Metro Economic Development Group, Triton submitted a proposal for federal funds to increase its capacity to provide workplace literacy program.

The project enabled Triton College to offer companies in its service area courses in English as a Second Language (ESL) and Adult Basic Education (ABE). The courses are taught 4 hours a week for 12 weeks, usually at the workplace before or after the workers' shifts. Companies that wish to have these classes offered to their employees must agree to pay the workers for 2 of the 4 hours they spend in class and pay Triton College a fee that covers 15 percent of the cost of instruction.

The project was originally scheduled for 12 months and received a 3 month, no-cost extension. Its first classes began in February 1989 and its last round of classes under the present funding began in February 1990. As of the end of January 1990, the project had conducted 53 courses for 11 different employers. In the courses that had been completed by the end of January 1990, 465 employees had been enrolled and 410 completed the courses, a completion rate of 88 percent. Almost two-thirds (63 percent) of the enrollments were in ESL classes.

At the end of January there were 113 employees attending on-going classes, and 15 more courses were scheduled to start in February. If these on-going and scheduled courses have the same enrollment and completion rates as the courses that are already completed, it is projected that an additional 220 employees will complete them. The total number who will have completed courses under the present funding is projected to be 630.

Project POWER follows practices generally accepted as the best available in the design and conduct of workplace literacy programs[1]. The project requires a commitment on the part of the employer, i.e., paying for part of the instructional costs as well as paying employees for half their class time. Project staff conduct literary audits of the basic skills needed on the job in individual companies. Materials specific to each company that require reading, writing, and computation are incorporated into the instruction for that company's employees. The course outlines are approved by the Illinois Community College Board.

Testing and individual interviews are conducted with potential students to assess existing skill levels and to identify any concerns or problems that might interfere with their performance in the courses. The project can provide day care and transportation allowances if students need such assistance to attend classes. Efforts are made to obtain instructors who have experience teaching adults in workplace settings. Much of the instruction is individualized with the teacher acting more as a coach or tutor rather than as a lecturer.

Outcomes

The evaluations completed at the end of the 12-week course indicate that the students responded very favorably to the procedures used by Project POWER[2]. Almost all the students rated all aspects of the courses good, very good, or excellent, with most of the ratings in the two highest categories. A Spanish translation of the questionnaire was used with students with limited ability in English. Tables 1 and 2 present the summaries of two sets of ratings for the ESL and ABE courses. The first set of ratings was tallied by the project staff and is labeled "staff." The second set was tallied by the CETE evaluator during

---

[1]Most or all of these practices are recommended in the following guides for workplace literacy programs: Business Council for Effective Literacy (1987); U.S Department of Education, U.S. Department of Labor (1988); Mikulecky (1988); Rush et al. (1986).

[2]Copies of the instruments used for evaluation are presented in the Appendix.

TABLE 1

STUDENT EVALUATIONS OF ESL COURSES
PROJECT STAFF AND CETE TALLIES

Course Ratings	Percent							
	Poor/Fair		Good		Very Good Excellent		No Response	
	Staff	CETE	Staff	CETE	Staff	CETE	Staff	CETE
1. The instructor presented lessons clearly so I could understand.	13	5	15	18	73	76	--	--
2. The instructor presented material at a good pace (speed) for me.	6	4	18	18	76	73	--	1
3. The instructor answered students' questions.	4	3	12	12	83	85	--	--
4. This course has helped me to improve in:								
a. Job Safety	2	4	17	31	33	63	52[a]	1
b. Job Performance (doing my job well)	2	1	11	34	39	60	67	6
c. Speaking to Co-Workers and Supervisors	5	7	6	22	40	67	50	4
d. Reading and Writing at Work	5	7	8	21	40	55	52	15
5. Instructor effectiveness	8	3	3	10	90	86	--	--
6. Textbooks	--	--	21	21	78	79	--	1
7. Handouts/materials	5	6	18	21	70	72	6	3
8. Classroom	14	6	17	19	70	73	--	1
9. General course evaluation	7	4	9	10	85	78	--	7

Note: Staff percentages based on 66 students.
CETE percentages based on 67 students.

[a]Approximately half of the staff tallies are based on an older version of the evaluation questionnaire that did not list items 4a to 4d.

TABLE 2

STUDENT EVALUATIONS OF ABE COURSES
PROJECT STAFF AND CETE TALLIES

Course Ratings	Percent							
	Poor/Fair		Good		Very Good Excellent		No Response	
	Staff	CETE	Staff	CETE	Staff	CETE	Staff	CETE
1. The instructor presented lessons clearly so I could understand.	--	--	10	3	87	97	3	--
2. The instructor presented material at a good pace (speed) for me.	10	3	10	3	77	95	3	--
3. The instructor answered students' questions.	3	--	--	--	87	97	10	3
4. This course has helped me to improve in:								
a. Job Safety	10	8	17	23	70	54	3	15
b. Job Performance (doing my job well)	7	3	17	13	60	74	17	10
c. Speaking to Co-Workers and Supervisors	3	3	13	15	60	64	23	18
d. Reading and Writing at Work	7	3	3	10	77	72	13	15
5. Instructor effectiveness	3	--	3	3	76	90	17	--
6. Textbooks	3	--	10	15	66	84	20	3
7. Handouts/materials	6	--	7	8	66	93	20	--
8. Classroom	10	5	17	15	67	90	7	--
9. General course evaluation	3	--	--	5	73	93	23	3

Note: Staff percentages based on 30 students.
CETE percentages based on 39 students.

his site visit on February 7 and 8, 1990. The patterns of responses are very much the same for both the staff and CETE tallies.

The students tended to give more "good" ratings and fewer "very good' and "excellent" ratings on items 4a to 4d. This means that some of the students were a little less positive on the relevance of the instruction to their jobs. Nevertheless, half to three-fourths of the respondents who completed these items still rated them "very good" and "excellent."

The project attempted to obtain overall (not individual) ratings of the improvement in the students' communication skills and job performance from their direct supervisors, but very few of these questionnaires were returned. Some that were returned were examined during the site visit, and the responses on these were very variable. Few supervisors completed the rating scales. This may be because the supervisors were asked to rate their workers as a group and were unable to make ratings that reflected the variability they saw in their workers. Due to the low response rate and incomplete data, no attempt was made to prepare a summary table of the supervisors questionnaires.

Instructors completed individual ratings of the progress their students had made in their courses. Table 3 presents the summarized tallies of a sample of these ratings selected from 22 different instructors in both ESL and ABE classes. These tallies were made by the CETE evaluator during his cite visit.

The instructors were not as positive in rating the students as the students were in rating the instructors. The instructors' ratings cluster in the "good" and "very good" categories. Note that the two lowest ratings are combined in table 3. There were very few ratings in the poor category.

The most stringent criterion of an instructional program is whether the tested performance of its students improves. To assess if there were improvements in the Project POWER courses, pre and posttest were administered. For the ESL classes, the English Language Skill Assessment was used. For the ABE classes the Test of Adult Basic Education was used.

Project staff complied reports of the average increase from pre to posttest for all courses that were completed by the end of 1989. These reports are included in the appendix. The gains reported are consistent with the number of hours of instruction the students received. There was no separate review of the achievement test scores during the site visit.

Questions have been raised, see, for example, Stricht and Mikulecky (1984), about the appropriateness of standardized reading tests for workplace literacy programs. Performance on

TABLE 3

SAMPLE OF INSTRUCTORS' RATINGS OF STUDENT PROGRESS IN ESL AND ABE COURSES

	Percent			
	Poor/Fair	Good	Very Good	Excellent
Listening				
ESL	19	29	32	16
ABE (reading/math)	9	32	41	18
Speaking				
ESL	25	32	29	10
ABE (reading only)	--	38	25	38
Reading				
ESL	16	58	16	6
ABE (reading only)	12	12	50	25
Writing				
ESL	32	38	23	3
ABE (reading only)	25	50	12	12
Class Participation				
ESL	13	16	38	29
ABE (reading/math)	9	36	27	27
Attendance				
ESL	13	19	32	32
ABE (reading/math)	37	32	5	27
Mathematics Confidence				
ABE (math only)	25	33	8	33
Mathematics Skills				
ABE (math only)	25	33	8	33

Note: ESL percentages based on 31 students.
ABE combined percentages based on 22 students.
ABE reading only based on 8 students, 2 students had no ratings on these items.
ABE math only based on 12 students.

these tests is usually reported in grade equivalency levels. That is, a score is converted to a scale based on the average performance of students in grades 1 to 12 or higher. Workplace literacy with it stress on material of immediate relevancy on the job may not address some of the kinds of knowledge measured by standardized tests.

Because of questions about the appropriateness of available tests, the gains found for Project POWER courses probably underestimate the actual improvement among the students. If a test based on the actual content taught were available, the gains would probably be larger than those reported.

Another type of outcome not measured by any instrument was reported to the CETE evaluator by the two employer representatives he interviewed during his site visit. Both of these employers volunteered that they though the workplace literacy classes made their workers feel better about their companies. Providing the opportunity to attend these class was seen by the workers as showing an interest in them, and this was reflected in a more positive attitude toward the companies

Achievement of Objectives

The original proposal submitted to the U.S. Department of Education listed three objectives for Project POWER. These objectives are presented below together with evidence on the degree to which they were accomplished.

OBJECTIVE I: To increase coordination efforts among education, business and labor, thereby encouraging greater participation in workplace literacy efforts.

The primary vehicle for achieving this objective was active cooperation by Triton College with the Labor-Management Center. The project director attended the monthly meetings of the Center board and submitted all requests by firms for Project POWER courses to the board for approval. Each of these requests were reviewed by a subcommittee of the board prior to submission, and consequently all that were submitted to the full board were approved. Requests that the subcommittee did not endorse were primarily from companies that could not guarantee that there would be at least eight workers who would enroll in a course, or companies that would not agree to pay for half the class time or to provide facilities.

The requirements for a significant financial commitment from firms (primarily in paying employees for half of their class time) appears to have limited the number of employers willing to participate. As of the end of January 1990, courses had been

conducted for 11 firms. Most of these firms appeared to be highly satisfied with the courses for an average of five courses were conducted for each one. The project appears to be serving a few firms well, but it is likely there are many more who could benefit.

OBJECTIVE II: To increase the number of on-site workplace literacy programs (ABE, adult literacy, GED, ESL) from an approximate average of 5 per year to 60 per year.

It was noted above that Project POWER had conducted 53 separate courses by the end of January 1990, and 15 more were scheduled. If all 15 are conducted, the project will exceed its objective.

One of the assumptions underlying this objective was that there would be cost efficiencies in establishing an ongoing capacity to provide workplace literacy programs. It was estimated above that a total of 630 students will have completed Project POWER courses if all scheduled courses are conducted. The proposal for this project indicates that the federal funding was $308,237. The federal cost per student would thus be $489, or $10.19 per contact hour. When the applicant's in-kind contribution, $453,693, is included, the total cost per student rises to $1209, or $25.18 per contact hour. Almost all of this additional cost (89 percent) represents the wages paid to employees for attending class.

A literature search was conducted to identify reports of other workplace literacy program against which the Project POWER cost could be compared. Only one was found that reported costs (Rosenfeld et al. 1987). This was a 2-week, full-time program conducted for 16 sanitation workers in Memphis, Tennessee. The instructional cost was reported to be $4,260 which translates into a per student cost of $266 for 80 hours of instruction, or $3.32 per contact hour. These costs seem very low and probably do not include the expenses of planning and preparing for the course. With only one other program, it is not possible to determine if the Project POWER model leads to cost efficiencies.

OBJECTIVE III: To increase the work-related performance levels of employees in order to have a minimum or 80 percent of the employees achieve performance levels established by the Literacy Skills Profile.

In the original planning of the project it was anticipated that a literacy skills profile would be established for each job against which the achievement of the students would be assessed. This proved to be too ambitious to accomplish. In most classes workers from several different jobs were represented. The instructors had to tailor the content to include material from as many of the jobs as possible rather than focusing on separate

jobs. Criterion-based profiles against which the performance of students could be assessed were not developed.

In the absence of the profiles it is not possible to say whether this objective was achieved. The best approximate measure is performance on pre and posttests. These results were reviewed above, and it was noted that gains are approximately what would be expected for the number of hours of instruction provided. All but one of the changes (45 of the 46) were positive.

Another way of looking at student performance is possible using short summaries of courses that the project prepared for separate employers. These summaries included data that allowed the percentage who improved their pre to posttest performance to be calculated for 214 students. Of these 214, 162 (76 percent) improved their scores. This pre to posttest improvement is not the same as assessing performance against a literacy skill profile, but the percentage with improvement is very close to the level specified in this objective.

The overall conclusion of this review is that Project POWER accomplished its objectives. The number of workplace literacy programs increased significantly and students in these classes improved their skills. Classes were evaluated positively by their students and by the firms that made them available to their employees.

The project accomplished these objectives by serving 11 employers, and about half of the total courses were conducted for just three companies: Entenmann's, Navistar, and M&M/Mars. The number of courses conducted for these companies reflects a high degree of satisfaction; the companies would not have agreed to additional courses if they were not satisfied with those conducted.

There is general agreement in the workplace literacy literature that for programs to be successful there must be management support. Project POWER ensured this support by requiring a financial contribution from the firms for which it conducted courses. This requirement, however, limited the number of companies that could be served, and the high concentration resulted in a substantial federal subsidy to the training for these companies.

Recommendations

Overall Project POWER appears to be a well conducted program that is filling a substantial training need in its service area. If the project receives continuation funding, efforts to recruit a wider number of employers should be pursued. One possibility to expand the number would be to attempt to locate two or more similar firms who would be willing to cooperate in offering courses.

From the evaluation perspective, the specification of literacy skill profiles in objective 3 should be eliminated. There is no indication in the proposal as to what these profiles would consist of. In addition, the variety of jobs included in each course made it impossible for the instructor to teach the skills needed in a particular job. The objective should be reworded with reference to skill improvements that can be directly assessed.

References

Business Council for Effective Literacy. Job-Related Basic Skills. A Guide for Planners of Employees Programs.BCEL Bulletin Issue No. 2. New York: Author, 1987.

Mikulecky, Larry. Literacy for the Workplace. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University, 1988.

Rosenfeld, Stuart A., and others. Learning While Earning: Worksite Literacy Programs. Research Triangle Park, NC: Southern Growth Policy Board, 1987.

Rush, R. Timothy, and other. Occupational Literacy Education. Newark, DE: International Reading Association, 1986.

Stricht, Thomas G.; and Mikulecky, Larry. Job-Related Basic Skills: Cases and Conclusions. Columbus, OH: ERIC Clearinghouse on Adult, Career, and Vocational Education, 1984.

U.S. Department of Education, and U.S. Department of Labor. The Bottom Line: Basic Skills in the Workplace. Washington, DC: Authors, 1988.

APPENDIX

Project POWER

ESL Assessment Summary

The following increases are based on an average of 50 hours of instruction.

Company	Course Number		Number Assessed	Ave. Point Increase	Ave. Level Increase*
Aallied Die Casting	ESLE34056	SU90	7	9.71	.43
A.G.I.	ESLE05057	SP89	14	18.00	.50
	ESLE07057	SP89	7	12.50	.43
	ESLE01055	FA90	8	14.66	.88
	WPEE01055	FA90	9	26.00	.78
	WPEE01	SP90			
	ESLE34	SP90			
American Rivet	ESLE01055	SP89	22	16.90	.59
	ESLE05058	SP89	17	9.64	.41
	WPEE01056	FA90	20	2.20	.20
	ESLE34055	FA90	14	.57	.07
	ESLE34	SP90			
	WPEE01	SP90			
Borg Warner	ESLE34056	SP89	9	19.11	.67
	ESLE34055	SP89	10	11.20	.40
Cratts Precision	WPEE01055	SP90			
	WPEE02055	SP90			
Entenmann's	WPEE01057	FA90	9	17.33	.89
	ESLE34056	FA90	5	28.00	1.00
	WPEE01058	FA90	14	38.90	1.36
	WPEC03055	FA90	3	6.00	.33
	ESLE34	SP90			
	ESLE34	SP90			
	WPEE01	SP90			
	WPEE03055	SP90			
Handy Button	ESLE34055	SP90			
Jacobs Suchard Inc.	ESLE34059	SU90	5	12.00	.20
	ESLE34100	SU90	9	17.77	.44
	ESLE34101	SU90	2	36.00	.50
	ESLE34058	SU90	4	8.00	.00
M&M/MARS	ESLE34055	SU90	6	20.66	.83
	ESLE34057	SU90	5	12.00	.80
	WPEE02	SP90			
	WPEE01	SP90			

U.S. Robotics	WPEC01055 SU90	3	13.33	.33
	WPEC02055 SU90	4	4.00	.00

*Triton ESL Level Placement System

ELSA Score:	0-11/BC	12-52/BC	53-76/BC
Level:	Begin. I	I (Begin. II)	II (Intermed. I)

ELSA Score:	36-56/IC	57-76/IC	77 and above
Level:	III (Intermed. II)	IV (Adv. I)	V (Adv. II)

(Triton College's Adult Basic Education department has found that it takes a minimum of 90 hours of instruction for the average ESL student to progress from one level to the next.)

The following averages are based on a total of 206 students:

Average point increase for ESL students completing classes by 12/31/89.....14.43

Average level increase for ESL students completing classes by 12/31/89..... .54

dc:336

Project POWER

Literacy Assessment Summary

The following mean scores (TABE) are based on an average of 48 hours of instruction.

Company	Course Number		Number Ass'd	Reading Voc.	Reading Comp.	Mathematics Compu.	Mathematics Appli.
Borg Warner	GEDE20057	SP89	14			.95	.96
	GEDE20055	SP89	7			1.87	.17
	GEDE20056	SP89	Cancelled				
Entenmann's	GEDE30055	FA90	Results not yet available				
	GEDE31055	FA90	due to work related attendance				
	GEDE21055	FA90	Completed 1/20/90. Scores apply				
	GEDE20055	FA90	to 4th quarter extension.				
	WPME01055	FA90	"		"	"	
	GEDE30056	FA90	"		"	"	
	WPLE02	SP90	10	Complete 6/2/90			
	WPLE02	SP90	10	Complete 6/2/90			
	WPME01	SP90	12	Complete 6/2/90			
	GEDE20	SP90	14	Complete 6/2/90			
Handy Button	WPME02055	SP90	11	Complete 2/27/90			
	WPME01055	SP90	17	Complete 2/26/90			
Jacobs Suchard Inc.	GEDE20100	SU90	9			2.53	1.33
	GEDE20059	SU90	4			1.17	.87
M&M/MARS	WPLC01055	SU90	9	16 Hrs. instruction no TABE			
	GEDE41055	SU90	8	1.40	.98		
	GEDE40055	SU90	6	-.31	.13		
	GEDE21055	SU90	9			2.80	.74
	GEDE20055	SU90	8			.60	.10
	WPME01	SP90	8	Complete 5/14/90			
	WPME02	SP90	10	Complete 5/14/90			

Literacy Assessment Summary Continued

Navistar	GEDE41056	SU90	3	.83	1.10
	GEDE20056	SU90	7	.82	1.74
	GEDE20058	SU90	7	1.61	.45
	GEDE20057	SU90	4	1.35	.90
	GEDE08055	FA90	7	16 Hrs. instruction no TABE.	
	WPME01056	FA90	24	Complete 1/30/90. Scores	
	WPME02055	FA90	10	apply to 4th quarter	
	GEDE41055	FA90	9	extension.	
	MAT043055	SP90	15	" " "	
	MAT043056	SP90	15	" " "	

According to Dr. Larry Mikulecky of Indiana University, 100 hours of average instruction are necessary for 1 grade level increase.

Mean score for all Literacy classes completed 12/31/89:

Vocabulary	Comprehension	Computation	Concepts/Application
.64	.73	1.52	.80

dc:316

WORKPLACE LITERACY COURSE EVALUATION

Course Title: _____

Company: _____

Dates: _____ Instructor: _____

***Please do not write your name on this evaluation.

1-Poor 2-Fair 3-Good 4-Very Good 5-Excellent

(Circle one)

1.	The instructor presented lessons clearly so I could understand.	1	2	3	4	5
2.	The instructor presented material at a good speed (pace) for me.	1	2	3	4	5
3.	The instructor answered students' questions.	1	2	3	4	5
4.	This course has helped me to improve in:					
	Job safety	1	2	3	4	5
	Job performance (doing my job well)	1	2	3	4	5
	Speaking to co-workers and supervisors	1	2	3	4	5
	Reading and writing at work	1	2	3	4	5

Please rate the quality of the following:

5.	Instructor effectiveness	1	2	3	4	5
6.	Textbooks	1	2	3	4	5
7.	Handouts/materials	1	2	3	4	5
8.	Classroom	1	2	3	4	5
9.	General course evaluation	1	2	3	4	5

10. What did you like the most about this course?

_____

_____

_____

11. How can this course be improved?

_____

_____

_____

WORKPLACE LITERACY COURSE EVALUATION

Course Title: _____ Company: _____

Dates: _____ Instructor: _____

***** Favor de no escribir su nombre en esta evaluacion.

1- Mal 2- Regular 3- Bueno 4- muy Bien 5- Excelente

(circule uno)

1.	Las lecciones fueron presentadas claramente para que yo pudiera entender.	1	2	3	4	5
2.	La materia fue presentada a un paso apropiado para mi.	1	2	3	4	5
3.	El maestro respondio a las preguntas de los estudiantes	1	2	3	4	5
4.	Este curso me ha ayudado a mejorar en:					
	El conocimiento de seguridad en el trabajo	1	2	3	4	5
	Habilidades (haciendo mi trabajo bien)	1	2	3	4	5
	Comunicarme con otros trabajadores y supervisores	1	2	3	4	5
	La escritura y lectura	1	2	3	4	5
Por favor indique la calidad de los siguiente:						
6.	El maestro (a)	1	2	3	4	5
7.	Los libros	1	2	3	4	5
8.	Materiales usados en la clase (ademas de los libros)	1	2	3	4	5
9.	El salon	1	2	3	4	5
10.	Evaluacion del curso en general	1	2	3	4	5

11. Que le gusto mas de este curso?

_____

_____

_____

12. Como podriamos mejorar este curso?

_____

_____

_____

Company _____

Instructor _____

Workplace ESL Student Evaluation

Name _____ Date _____

Department _____

Level _____ Class times _____

Please rate student's progress in the following areas:

	Poor (No improvement)	Fair	Good	Very Good	Excellent (Much improvement)
Listening	____	____	____	____	____
Speaking	____	____	____	____	____
Reading	____	____	____	____	____
Writing	____	____	____	____	____
Class participation	____	____	____	____	____
Attendance	____	____	____	____	____

Comments:

Strengths:

Areas for improvement:

Signature of teacher _____

Company _____

Workplace ESL Program
End of Term Evaluation
(Departmental Supervisors)

Department _____ Date _____

1. How many employees from your department or section participated in English classes during the past cycle?

   _____

2. In your opinion, what improvements have students in the English classes made in the following areas? Please check the appropriate column.

	Greatly improved	Somewhat improved	No change that I can see
Communication Skills:			
a. Listening (Understanding oral instructions, policies, etc.)	_____	_____	_____
b. Speaking	_____	_____	_____
c. Reading	_____	_____	_____
d. Writing	_____	_____	_____
Job Performance:			
e. Productivity	_____	_____	_____
f. Product quality	_____	_____	_____
g. Efficiency	_____	_____	_____
h. Reduction in turnover	_____	_____	_____
i. Safety record	_____	_____	_____

3. Would you like to see these classes continued?

   _____ Yes _____ No

4. Please check the areas in which you would like to see changes:

   a. Scheduling of classes _____

   b. Course content _____

   c. Attendance reporting _____

   d. Registration procedures _____

   e. Other: _____

5. What suggestions would you make to improve the ESL Program?